

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROBERT B. LeBLANC,

Plaintiff,

No. 06-13588

vs.

Hon. Gerald E. Rosen

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

At a session of said Court, held in
the U.S. Courthouse, Detroit, Michigan
on October 02, 2013

PRESENT: Honorable Gerald E. Rosen
United States District Chief Judge

On July 25, 2013, the Court entered an Opinion and Order and Judgment denying Plaintiff's post-appeal Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) Motion for Relief from Judgment. Plaintiff now moves for reconsideration.

The requirements for the granting of motions for reconsideration are set forth in Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(h), which provides in relevant part:

Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

L.R. 7.1(h)(1), (3).

As provided in LR 7.1(h)(3), in order to prevail on a motion for reconsideration, the movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the Court has been misled, he must also show that a different disposition of the case must result from a correction of that defect. A “palpable defect” is “a defect that is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.” *United States v. Lockette*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 682, 684 (E.D. Mich. 2004).

Moreover, a motion that merely presents the same issues already ruled upon by the Court - - either expressly or by reasonable implication -- will not be granted. L.R. 7.1(g); *see also Flanagan v. Shamo*, 111 F. Supp. 2d 892, 894 (E.D. Mich. 2000). Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration does just that -- it presents the same issues already ruled upon by the Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.

For these reasons,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration [**Dkt. # 32**] is DENIED.

s/Gerald E. Rosen
Chief Judge, United States District Court

Dated: October 2, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on October 2, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Julie Owens
Case Manager, (313) 234-5135